

REMARKS

Claims

Claims 1, 2, 10, 15–19, 22–23, 25–28, 30–37, 40–43, 61–63, 67–70, 79–81 and 83–84 are currently pending with claims 11–13, 29, 38, 44–47, 49–53, 55–60, 64–66, 71, and 74–78 withdrawn from consideration. Claims 3–9, 14, 20, 21, 24, 39, 48, 54, 72–73 and 82 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claim 85 is added by this paper.

Claim amendments

The claims have been amended to correct for typographical errors and to use language in accordance with conventional US practice.

The amendment of claim 10 is supported by the disclosure contained in, for example, page 13, lines 25–35 of the specification, as originally filed.

The cancelled subject matter of claim 40 is now recited in new claim 85.

The structural elements recited in amended claim 62, which conform to Applicants' independent claim 1, is supported by the disclosure contained in, for example, pages 17 and 18 of the instant specification, as originally filed.

It is courteously submitted that the claim amendments do not raise new matter.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's careful reading of claims. It is earnestly submitted that the rejection is moot in view of the amendments.

Claim 1 has been amended as per the Examiner's suggestion.

The language of claim 10 is analogous to that of claims 30 and 33, which fully conforms to the statutory requirements under 35 USC §112, ¶2. The amendment is further supported by the disclosure contained in Applicants' instant specification. See, for example, page 13, lines 25–35 of the specification, as originally filed.

The objection of claim 24 is moot in view of cancellation of the claim. No agreement is to be implied.

Claims 62 and 63 are amended to recite "intrinsic pathway," which is supported by the disclosure contained in, for example, the last paragraph at page 12 of the specification, as originally filed. The claimed aspect also constitutes the subject matter of Applicants' claim 23.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph (enablement)

Claim 62 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph as allegedly failing to


comply with the enablement requirement. This rejection is moot in view of the amendment of the claim. This is not to be construed as acquiescence to the rejection, but is purely submitted in order to expedite prosecution. Applicants reserve the right to reintroduce cancelled subject matter during prosecution.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In view of the above remarks, it is courteously submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. If there are any remaining issues which could be expedited by a telephone conference, the Examiner is courteously invited to telephone counsel at the number indicated below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with this response to Deposit Account No. 13-3402.

Respectfully submitted,



Anthony J. Zelano, Reg. No. 27,969
Attorney for Applicant(s)

MILLEN, WHITE, ZELANO
& BRANIGAN, P.C.
Arlington Courthouse Plaza 1, Suite 1400
2200 Clarendon Boulevard
Arlington, Virginia 22201
Telephone: (703) 243-6333
Facsimile: (703) 243-6410

Attorney Docket No.: **WEICKM-0014**

Date: July 10, 2007